



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/730,619

12/08/2003

Burkhard Becker

L&L-10225

4277

24131 7590 12/21/2006
LERNER GREENBERG STEMER LLP
P O BOX 2480
HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480

EXAMINER

CHOE, YONG J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2185

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

12/21/2006

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/730,619

Applicant(s)

BECKER

Examiner

Yong Choe

Art Unit

2185

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/08/2003.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The instant application having Application No. 10/730619 has a total of 20 claims pending in the application. There are 2 independent claims (e.g., claim 1 and 11) and 18 dependent claims, all of which are ready for examination by the examiner.

Priority

2. As required by M.P.E.P. 201.14(c), acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority based on an application filed on 12/08/2003.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. As required by M.P.E.P. 609 (C), the applicant's submission of the information Disclosure Statement dated 12/08/2003 is acknowledged by the examiner and the cited references have been considered in the examination of the claims now pending. As required by M.P.E.P. 609 C(2), a copy of the PTOL-1449 initialed and dated by the examiner is attached to the instant office action.

Oath/Declaration

4. The applicant's oath/declaration has been reviewed by the examiner and is found to conform to the requirements prescribed in 37 C.F.R. 1.63.

Drawings

5. The drawings submitted on 12/08/2003 are acceptable for examination purposes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1~6, 8, 11~15, 18 and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hess (US Patent No.: US 4,405,980)** in view of **Tipon et al. (US Patent No.: 5,150,471)**.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 11, Hess discloses a method for transmitting data of a plurality of data types between a digital processor and a hardware arithmetic-logic unit, the method which comprises:

associating the hardware arithmetic-logic unit (Fig.1: ALU) with at least one table memory (Fig.1 AKU), the hardware arithmetic-logic unit (Fig.1: ALU) obtaining data required during a computing operation (Fig.1: instruction) from the table memory (Fig.1: AKU) and/or the hardware arithmetic-logic unit storing data computed during a computing operation in the table memory (col.5, lines 54~66); and

Hess does not specifically teach reading and/or writing from the digital processor to the table memory by:

preselecting a base address in the table memory dependent on a data type of data to be transmitted, and accessing the table memory with the digital processor by taking the preselected base address as a starting point for computing, according to a prescribed arithmetic computation rule in hardware, a plurality of addresses used for consecutive read access operations and/or consecutive write access operations in the table memory.

However, Tipon et al. teaches reading and/or writing from the digital processor (Fig.1: processor 12) to the table memory by:

preselecting a base address in the table memory (Fig.1: base address register 18) dependent on a data type of data to be transmitted, and accessing the table memory with the digital processor (Fig.1: processor 12) by taking the preselected base address as a starting point for computing, according to a prescribed arithmetic computation rule in hardware (Fig.1: ALU 24), a plurality of addresses used for consecutive read access operations and/or consecutive write access operations in the table memory (col.3, lines 15~32 and col.6, lines 6~29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the base address as taught by Tipon et al. into transmitting data of a plurality of data types between a digital processor and a hardware arithmetic-logic unit of Hess in order to increase processing speed (col.2, line 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the base address as taught by Tipon et al. with transmitting data of a plurality of data types between a digital processor and a hardware arithmetic-logic unit of Hess to obtain the invention.

Regarding claim 2, Tipon et al. teaches storing a plurality of base addresses associated with a plurality of different data types in a base address register, the base address that was preselected being one of the plurality of base addresses; and performing the step of preselecting the base address by using the processor to set a selection bit associated with the base address (col.6, lines 6~17).

Regarding claim 3, Tipon et al. teaches prescribing the plurality of base addresses unalterably in hardware (see Fig.1: base address register 18).

Regarding claim 4, Hess teaches providing the arithmetic computation rule for computing the plurality of addresses in the table memory as an incrementation rule or a decrementation rule (col.2, lines 25~40).

Regarding claim 5, Tipon et al. teaches programming the base address (Fig.1: base address register) with the digital processor (Fig.1: processor 12).

Regarding claim 6, Tipon et al. teaches the digital processor, programming at least one information item selected from a group consisting of information relating to a number of data items being written to or read from a plurality of memory subareas associated with the base address, information about a block size of data blocks, information about a decoding rate, and information about utilized convolution polynomials (col.3, lines 49~56).

Regarding claim 8, Tipon et al. teaches providing a second data type as trace back values computed by a decoder hardware arithmetic-logic unit; and with the digital processor, programming how many states the trace back values need to include (see Fig.1).

Regarding claim 12, Tipon et al. teaches said base address memory device is an external base address register designed such that in order to select the base address, said processor sets a selection bit associated with the base address (see Fig.1).

Regarding claim 13, Hess teaches said base address memory device is a read only memory (col.7, lines 1~5).

Regarding claim 14, Hess et al. teaches wherein said base address memory device is a rewritable memory that can be programmed by the digital processor (col.5, lines 54~57: RAM is a rewritable memory that can be programmed by the digital processor.).

Regarding claim 15, Tipon et al. teaches a configuration memory; said table memory including memory subareas; and said configuration memory for storing information selected from a group consisting of information relating to a number of data items being written to or read from a plurality of said memory subareas associated with the base address, information about a block size of data blocks, information about a decoding rate, and information about utilized convolution polynomials (col.3, lines 49~56).

Regarding claim 18, Tipon et al. teaches wherein said table memory has a prescribed memory word length (col.5, lines 65~67).

Regarding claim 20, Tipon et al. teaches said hardware arithmetic-logic unit includes an equalizer hardware arithmetic-logic unit and a decoder hardware arithmetic-logic unit; said processor includes a data transmission connection to said equalizer hardware arithmetic-logic unit; and said processor includes a data transmission connection to said decoder hardware arithmetic-logic unit (see Fig.1).

8. **Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hess (US Patent No.: US 4,405,980)** in view of **Tipon et al. (US Patent No.: 5,150,471)** and in further view of **Stafford et al. (US Patent No.: US 3,833,888)**.

Regarding claim 7, Hess and Tipon et al. do not specifically teach providing a first data type of the plurality of data types as soft input values for channel decoding that are intended for a decoder hardware arithmetic-logic unit; and with the digital processor, programming how many soft input values per unit time can be stored in a memory subarea associated with the first data type

However, Stafford et al. teaches providing a first data type of the plurality of data types as soft input values for channel decoding that are intended for a decoder hardware arithmetic-logic unit; and with the digital processor, programming how many soft input values per unit time can be stored in a memory subarea associated with the first data type (see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the digital processor as taught by Stafford et al. into transmitting data of a plurality of data types between a digital processor and a hardware arithmetic-logic unit of Hess as modified by Tipon et al. in order to provide an enhanced controlling unit in a data processing system (col.2, line 41~42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious combine to the digital processor as taught by Stafford et al. with transmitting data of a plurality of data types between a digital processor and a hardware arithmetic-logic unit of Hess as modified by Tipon et al. to obtain the invention.

9. **Claims 9 and 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hess (US Patent No.: US 4,405,980)** in view of **Tipon et al. (US Patent No.: 5,150,471)** and in further view of **Dove et al. (US Patent No.: US 6,310,891)**.

Regarding claim 9, Hess and Tipon et al. do not specifically teach choosing a packing mode causing a plurality of data words, output by the processor for performing the step of accessing the table memory, to be combined to form a memory data word for the table memory.

However, Dove et al. teaches choosing a packing mode causing a plurality of data words, output by the processor for performing the step of accessing the table memory, to be combined to form a memory data word for the table memory (see Fig.2: packed mode).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the packed/unpacked mode as taught by Dove et al. into transmitting data of a plurality of data types between a digital processor and a hardware arithmetic-logic unit of Hess as modified by Tipon et al. because it allows the asynchronous cells (col.2, line 11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious combine to incorporate the packed/unpacked mode as taught by Dove et al. with transmitting data of a plurality of data types between a digital processor and a hardware arithmetic-logic unit of Hess as modified by Tipon et al. to obtain the invention.

Regarding claim 10, Hess and Tipon et al. do not specifically teach choosing an unpacking mode causing a memory data word, read from the table memory when performing the step of accessing the table memory, to be broken down into a plurality of data words before being input into the processor.

However, Dove et al. teaches choosing an unpacking mode causing a memory data word, read from the table memory when performing the step of accessing the table memory, to be broken down into a plurality of data words before being input into the processor (see Fig. 1: unpacked mode).

10. **Claims 16 and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hess (US Patent No.: US 4,405,980)** in view of **Tipon et al. (US Patent No.: 5,150,471)** and in further view of **Oami (US Patent No.: US 6,363,119)**.

Regarding claim 16, Hess and Tipon et al. do not specifically teach a multiplexer and buffer device for assembling a plurality of data words output by said processor to form a memory data word intended for being stored at an address in said table memory.

However, Oami teaches a multiplexer and buffer device for assembling a plurality of data words output by said processor to form a memory data word intended for being stored at an address in said table memory (col.25, lines 51~61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the multiplexer and buffer device as taught by Oami into transmitting data of a plurality of data types between a digital processor and a hardware arithmetic-logic unit of Hess as modified by Tipon et al. in order to improve coding efficiency (col.4, line 53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious combine to the multiplexer and buffer device as taught by Oami with transmitting data of a plurality of data types between a digital processor and a hardware arithmetic-logic unit of Hess as modified by Tipon et al. to obtain the invention.

Regarding claim 17, Hess and Tipon et al. do not specifically teach a demultiplexer and buffer device for, before being input into said processor, breaking down a memory data word read from said table memory into a plurality of data words.

However, Oami teaches a demultiplexer and buffer device for, before being input into said processor, breaking down a memory data word read from said table memory into a plurality of data words (col.22, lines 14~20 and lines 45~55).

11. **Claim 19** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hess (US Patent No.: US 4,405,980)** in view of **Tipon et al. (US Patent No.: 5,150,471)** and in further view of **Serizawa et al. (US Patent No.: US 5,311,523)**.

Regarding claim 19, Hess and Tipon et al. do not specifically teach said hardware arithmetic-logic unit is a Viterbi hardware arithmetic-logic unit.

However, Serizawa et al. teaches said hardware arithmetic-logic unit is a Viterbi hardware arithmetic-logic unit (Fig.5 is a block diagram showing the structure of the Viterbi algorithm arithmetic).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Viterbi hardware arithmetic-logic unit as taught by Serizawa et al. into transmitting data of a plurality of data types between a digital processor and a hardware arithmetic-logic unit of Hess as modified by Tipon et al. in order to obtain good error rate performance (col.3, line 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Viterbi hardware arithmetic-logic unit as taught by Serizawa et al. with transmitting data of a plurality of data types between a digital processor and a hardware arithmetic-logic unit of Hess as modified by Tipon et al. to obtain the invention.

Conclusion

12. Claims rejected in the application

Per the instant office action, claims 1-20 have received a first action on the merits and are subject of a first action non-final.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to **Yong Choe** at telephone number **571-270-1053**. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am to 5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Sanjiv Shah** can be reached on **571-272-4098**. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

YC

Yong J. Choe
Examiner / Art Unit 2185


SANJIV SHAH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

SANJIV SHAH
SUPERVISORY PATENT
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100